

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Abraham T. North, Jr.,) C.A. #2:05-3483-PMD
)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.) **ORDER**
)
Court One Corporation,)
)
Defendant.)
_____)

The above-captioned case is before this court upon the magistrate judge's recommendation that the case be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the magistrate judge's report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, absent prompt objection by a dissatisfied party, it appears that Congress did not intend for the district court to review the factual and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge. Thomas v Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Additionally, any party who fails to file timely, written objections to the magistrate judge's report pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) waives the right to raise those objections at the appellate court level. United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984). No objections have been filed to the magistrate judge's report.

A review of the record indicates that the magistrate judge's report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. For the reasons articulated by the magistrate judge, it is hereby **ordered** that the within case is hereby **DISMISSED** for lack of subject

matter jurisdiction.

ORDERED, that the magistrate judge's report and recommendation is adopted as the order of this Court, and

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.



PATRICK MICHAEL DUFFY
United States District Judge

Charleston, South Carolina
June 13, 2006

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this Order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.